

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

### REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

In the specification, the Abstract has been amended.

Claim 15 is currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 are now pending in this application.

### Election/Restrictions

The Examiner required restriction to Group I, Claims 1-9, drawn to a handheld computer, or Group II, Claims 10-20, drawn to method of using an email application in a wireless environment. The Examiner indicated that during a telephone conversation with Alistair K. Chan on July 14, 2004 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group II, Claims 10-20. Applicants hereby affirm the election to prosecute the invention of Group II, Claims 10-20 which was made on July 14, 2004.

### Specification

The Examiner has reminded the Applicant of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. Applicants have amended the Abstract to remove use of the wording "A handheld computer is disclosed". Applicants thereby request that any objection to the Abstract be withdrawn.

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner indicated the term “desired manner” in Claim 15 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. Applicants have removed the term “desired manner” from Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants request that the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected Claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 in which the Examiner indicated that it has not been disclosed how limitations in Claims 17-19 are taking place. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to paragraph [0024] in which it is indicated that the launching application changes parameters of the handheld computer or the functionality needed by the software application. Once the proper or needed functionality is provided or the proper parameters have been set, the software application is then automatically run by the launching application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that it has been disclosed how the limitations in Claims 17-19 are taking place. Thus, claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 of Claims 17-19 are requested to be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner indicated that Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chandrasekhar Narayanaswami (U.S. Patent No. 6,678,535). The Examiner has indicated that Narayanaswami teaches all of the claim limitations of Claims 10 and 15. In particular, the Examiner indicates that Narayanaswami teaches “providing an email application not configured for use over a wireless connection on a handheld computer at column 10, lines 9-12. To this assertion, Applicants disagree. What was disclosed in Narayanaswami is that software on the device (transcoder software converts received data into a format which is used by the device or other devices). Converting received data by the device is not the same as providing an email application that is not configured for use over a wireless connection. Narayanaswami

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

does not describe providing any type of email application that is not configured for use over a wireless connection.

Further, the Examiner indicates that Narayanaswami discloses providing a launching application on a handheld computer, the launching application displaying an icon on a handheld computer representative of the email application. Applicants respectfully submit that Narayanaswami does not disclose or teach providing a separate launching application on a handheld computer, the launching application displaying an icon on the handheld computer that is representative of the email application. The idea is that the launching application is completely transparent to the user and the user is unaware of the launching application. What is described in Narayanaswami is that an icon is displayed on the handheld computer, the icon not being associated with a separate launching application. Rather, the icon is associated with the e-mail application itself. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claim limitations of Claims 10 and 15 are not taught or disclosed by Narayanaswami. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of independent Claims 10 and 15 and their respective dependent claims.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants submit that Claims 16 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims rejected under § 103 are dependent claims which depend from Claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants have not specifically responded to the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 but are reliant on the fact that the Applicants believe Claim 15 to be allowable. Therefore, Applicants believe that Claims 16-20 are also allowable.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to

Atty. Dkt. No. 025782-0108 f/k/a 035451-0129 (3631.Palm)

Deposit Account No. 06-1447. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 06-1447. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1447.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 10, 2004

By Alistair K. Chan

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 26371  
Telephone: (414) 297-5730  
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Alistair K. Chan  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,603